



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,754	02/08/2002	Chris R. Snider	DP-305026	9283

7590 06/18/2003

STEFAN V. CHMIELEWSKI  
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
Legal Staff, Mail Code: A-107  
P.O. Box 9005  
Kokomo, IN 46904-9005

EXAMINER

COURSON, TANIA C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2859

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/068,754

Applicant(s)

SNIDER, CHRIS R.

Examiner

Tania C. Courson

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. An indicator feature (i.e. halo section illuminates) is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure.

See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Claims 2-7 and 9-13 are rejected due to their dependency on claims 1 and 8, respectively.

3. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. It is confusing as to what is a "compensation pass". Neither the specification nor the drawings adequately describe this feature. It is not clear how the "compensation pass allow(s) backlighting to be adjusted and controlled" when there is no lighting/indicating feature in the independent claims (see paragraph 2), even if there was a lighting/indicating feature, it is still unclear as to how "a compensation pass" would function.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagel (US 4,583,151).

Nagel discloses in Figures 1-2, an illuminated display comprising:

With respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 8, and 13:

- a) a translucent base (Fig. 2, translucent sleeve 14) including an outer surface having an upper portion and a lower portion (Fig. 2), a halo section located on said lower portion of said outer surface (Fig. 2), an appliqué element (Fig. 2, plate 17) mounted on said translucent base and an opaque over mold mounted on said appliqué element and covering a portion of said outer surface not including said halo section (Fig. 2, operator display 10);
- b) wherein said appliqué element extends to cover said halo section (Fig. 2);
- c) a mounting panel wherein said halo section illuminates at least a portion of said mounting panel (column 3, line 64 through column 4, line 2).

Art Unit: 2859

With respect to method claims 14-16: The method steps claimed will be met during the normal operation of the apparatus stated above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-5 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagel in view of Prior Art (specification, page 5, lines 1-3).

Nagel discloses an illuminated display, as stated above in paragraph 5.

Nagel does not disclose the opaque over mold including a soft touch surface, and the appliqué element including a daytime and a lowlight screening.

The use of a soft touch surface instead of the nylon surface material disclosed by Nagel to make the opaque over mold, absent any criticality, is only considered to be the use of a “preferred” or “optimum” type of nylon material that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have find obvious to provide using routine experimentation based, among other things, on the intended use of Applicant’s apparatus, i.e., suitability for the intended use of Applicant’s apparatus. See In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416

Art Unit: 2859

(CCPA 1960 ) where the court stated that a selection of a material on the basis of suitability for intended use of an apparatus would be entirely obvious.

The Prior Art teaches the appliqué element that consists of a daytime and a lowlight screening (specification, page 5, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the illuminating display of Nagel, so as to include a daytime and a lowlight screening, as taught by the Prior Art, so as to provide a commonly used appliqué materials such as those providing daytime and low light colorations, as disclosed by the Applicant.

8. With respect to claims 6 and 12: the prior art of record has not been applied to claims 6 and 12 due to the lack of description as stated above in paragraph 3.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art cited on PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose illuminating devices:

Liao et al. (US 6,565,223 B2)

Lang (US 4,549,050)

Hardesty (US 2,831,453)

Appleman (US 2,693,165)

Art Unit: 2859

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tania C. Courson whose telephone number is (703) 305-3031.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez, can be reached on (703) 308-3875. The fax number for this Organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7724.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



DIEGO F.F. GUTIERREZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP ART UNIT 2859.

TCC  
June 12, 2003